

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. The below comments present in greater detail distinctive features of applicants' claimed invention over the cited art that were conveyed to the Examiner over the telephone on November 9, 2007. It was submitted to the Examiner that the claimed subject matter relates to sharing a first computer object and also automatically its associations with other computer objects with a second computer space wherein at least a subset of the other computer objects is already present in the second computer space. In contrast, Kenyon *et al.* relates to a user generating an overlay for organizing and navigating digital information objects from a user's perspective, using concept nodes wherein overlay can be shared with others and can also be downloaded as a file. Hence, rather than teaching sharing a computer object and its associations with other objects already present in a second computer space, Kenyon *et al.* teaches sharing all the computer objects and their associations as an overlay

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 6-10 and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 3, 6-10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kenyon, *et al.* (US 6,792,430 B1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Kenyon *et al.* fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it ***expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation*** set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). ***The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.*** *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicant's claimed subject matter teaches a method of sharing computer objects between different computer spaces. To this end, independent claim 1 recites *a context*

association system for forming context associations between first and second objects that are stored in computer memory and are associated with each other based on user computer interactions, a method of sharing computer objects, comprising: storing association information relating to one or more associations between a selected object in a first computer space and one or more first objects in the first computer space, wherein the objects are at least one of files, applications, contact and communications; sharing the selected object from the first computer space with a second computer space, the second computer space including at least one of the first objects; and automatically sharing from the first computer space with the second computer space the one or more associations in the first computer space between the selected object and the at least one first object in the second computer space. Independent claim 10 recites similar features. Kenyon *et al.* does not disclose such claim features.

Kenyon *et al.* provides for a method of generating a navigational model for linking together information objects on an existing information space. At page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner contends that Kenyon *et al.* discloses novel features of applicant's claimed invention. Applicant's representative avers to the contrary. In accordance with the subject invention, association information relating to associations between a selected object and other objects in the first computer space is stored. The computer objects can be computer files, contacts, applications, computer communications etc., and the association information are based on contextual associations determined based upon user interactions with the objects. When an object from the first computer is shared with a second computer space that already contains at least one of the objects in the first computer space, the association information between the copied object and the other objects in the second computer space that are associated with it, is also shared. At the cited portions, Kenyon *et al.* discloses a user generating an overlay for organizing and navigating digital information objects from a user's perspective, using concept nodes. The user creates an overly with concepts, each concept is a node described by at least one keyword. When the user accesses an object such as a page on the WWW specified by a URL, the object is checked for the occurrence of the keywords in the overlay, if keywords are found, an association is made with other objects in the nodes described by that keyword. Further, Kenyon *et al.* discloses that the overlay can be shared with others and can also be downloaded as a file. However, Kenyon *et al.* is silent regarding *sharing the selected object from the first computer space with a second computer space, the second computer space including at least*

one of the first objects; and automatically sharing from the first computer space with the second computer space the one or more associations in the first computer space between the selected object and the at least one first object in the second computer space as recited by the subject claims.

When a selected object is shared with a second computer space that already contains at least one of the objects in the first computer space, associations between the shared object and existing object common to both the computer spaces are also automatically shared. This allows the associations between the objects to be used in the new computer space to access the shared functionality between the objects.

From the foregoing, it is clear that an identical invention as recited in the subject claims is not disclosed or suggested by Kenyon *et al.* Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection with respect to independent claims 1, and 10 (and the claims that depend there from) should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 2, 5, 11 and 14 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2, 5, 11 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenyon, *et al.* (US 6,792,430 B1) in view of Batty, *et al.* (US 6,223,212 B1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Claims 2, 5, 11 and 14 respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 10. As discussed *supra*, Kenyon *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest all features of amended independent claims 1 and 10. Batty *et al.* relates to techniques for coordinating the sharing of an application with multiple computer systems, and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Kenyon *et al.* Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 4, 13 and 15-21 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 4, 13 and 15-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenyon, *et al.* (US 6,792,430 B1) in view of Batty, *et al.* (US 6,223,212 B1) as applied to claims 3 and 12 above, and further in view of Hatori (US 2003/00221122 A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Kenyon *et al.*, Batty *et al.* and Hatori *et al.* fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

Claims 4 and 13 respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 10. As

discussed *supra*, Kenyon *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest all features of amended independent claims 1 and 10. Batty *et al.* relates to techniques for coordinating the sharing of an application with multiple computer systems, and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Kenyon *et al.* Hatori *et al.* relates to a computer enhancing a security level when connecting to a network, and fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Kenyon *et al.* and Batty *et al.*

Independent claim 15 recites *in a context association system for forming context associations between first and second objects that are stored in computer memory and are associated with each other based on user computer interactions, a method of sharing computer objects, comprising: storing association information relating to one or more associations between a selected object in a first computer space and a second computer space, wherein the objects are at least one of files, applications, contacts or communications; initiating sharing of the selected object from the first computer space with the second computer space; determining whether the association of the selected object with the second computer space is of an extent greater than a predetermined threshold; and interfering with the sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if the association of the selected object with the second computer space is not of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold.* Independent claim 19 recites similar features. Kenyon *et al.*, Batty *et al.* and Hatori *et al.* fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

Kenyon *et al.* discloses a method of generating a navigational model for linking together information objects on an existing information space. At page 8 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner concedes that Kenyon *et al.* does not disclose such novel features. The Examiner cites Batty *et al.* and Hatori *et al.* to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Kenyon *et al.*

Batty *et al.* relates to techniques for coordinating the sharing of an application with multiple computer systems. At the cited portions, Batty *et al.* discloses a host computer sharing an application with multiple computer systems (shadows). To enable the shadow computer system to display an accurate representation of the output data from the application, each computer exchanges capabilities that indicate how input data to an application is to be processed and how output data from an application is to be displayed.

The capabilities consist of display capabilities supported by the computer, like pixel depth, desktop size, order formats, font data and palette data and as such do not constitute association information between objects in a computer. In contrast, the claimed invention teaches an extent of association to be determined between the object to be shared and the second computer space the object is to be shared with. If the second computer space is determined to have a strong association with the selected object or one of the objects in the cluster, such as by having received or created them previously, then the sharing proceeds. Otherwise it is interrupted. Thus Batty *et al.* is silent regarding ***determining whether the association of the selected object with the second computer space is of an extent greater than a predetermined threshold*** as recited by the subject claims.

Hatori *et al.* relates to a computer enhancing a security level when connecting to a network. At the cited portions, Hatori *et al.* discloses a user setting security information in association with a network connection to be used, storing the security information in a predetermined memory and disabling processes related to sharing files, performed by other network connected computers based on the stored security information. However, Hatori *et al.* is silent regarding ***interfering with the sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if the association of the selected object with the second computer space is not of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold*** as recited by the subject claims.

From the foregoing, it is clear that Kenyon *et al.*, Batty *et al.* and Hatori *et al.* fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the subject claims. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection with respect to independent claims 15 and 19 (and the claims that depend there from) should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP685US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731